


**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

ROBERT L. HATCHER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-24-377-SLP
)	
SYLVAIN YANG and)	
TRAVIS SMITH,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On July 17, 2024, the Court directed Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to effect service of process within 90 days of the filing of the Complaint. *See* Order [Doc. No. 7]. Plaintiff filed proofs of service showing Defendants were served on July 23, 2024 by a United States Marshal, after expiration of the 90-day period. *See* Process Receipts and Returns [Doc. No. 8]. Plaintiff also responded to the Court's show cause Order. *See* Response [Doc. No. 9].

The Court must extend the deadline for service when a plaintiff shows good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). In the absence of good cause, the Court has discretion to grant a permissive extension. *Espinoza v. United States*, 52 F.3d 838, 841 (10th Cir. 1995). Based on Plaintiff's pro se status and his efforts to obtain service as reflected in his Response, the Court finds the circumstances of this case justify a permissive extension. Accordingly, the Court retroactively GRANTS Plaintiff a permissive extension of time to effect service and finds the service on July 23, 2024 is timely.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 29th day of July, 2024.



SCOTT L. PALK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE